DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 161 971 UD 018 365

AUTHOR Gappert, Gary
TITLE Federal Aid, Urban Schools and State Responsibility for Quality of Life.
PUB DATE Dec 77
NOTE 39p.; Page 7 may not reproduce well due to reproduction quality of the original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *City Planning; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Aid; Federal State Relationship; *Government Role; Government School Relationship; Local Government; *Quality of Life; *State Aid; *State Government; Urban Education; Urban Environment; *Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

This paper attempts to lay the analytical foundation for understanding that urban schools must be viewed as the cornerstone of social reconstruction of older cities. It is shown that the improvement of neglected urban schools represents an opportunity for new initiatives by both Federal and State governments. The States' responsibility both for education and the structure of local and urban government should provide incentives for States to develop a State urban policy, and remove the disincentives or barriers to such a policy. Such action would leave the ultimate responsibility for the quality of life in urban society to State legislatures, rather than to the White House. The paper develops a number of contrary perspectives on the cities and states some general assumptions about a new urban policy. Fiscal realities and the problems of State educational aid serving to subsidize municipal overburden are also discussed. Finally, a perspective on national urban educational policy is developed and ideas for Federal educational policy are proposed. (Author/KR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED161971

Federal Aid, Urban Schools and State Responsibility for Quality of Life

by

Gary Gappert, Ph.D.
Assistant Commissioner
Division of Research, Planning and Evaluation
New Jersey State Department of Education

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gary Gappert

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

CG018365

Submitted to the Subcommittee on the City, U.S. Congress

December 1977

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper is an attempt to lay the analytical foundation for understanding that urban schools must be viewed as the fundamental cornerstone of the social reconstruction of our older cities. Furthermore, the improvement of our neglected urban schools represents an opportunity for new initiatives by both federal and state governments.

The plight and the promise of our urban schools also provides a reminder that it is ultimately the states which have responsibility both for education and the structure of local and urban governments. The ultimate responsibility for the quality of life in urban society must rest in the State Houses of our fifty states and not in a single White House. The federal government should provide incentives for states to develop a state urban policy, and remove the disincentives or barriers to such a policy.

In the paper we first develop a number of contrary perspectives on the cities. Then we state some general assumptions about a new urban policy. In the fourth section we discuss fiscal realities and the problems of state educational aid serving to subsidize municipal overburden. We then develop a perspective on national urban "educational" policy and conclude with some proposals for federal educational policy.

II. CONTRARY PERSPECTIVES ON THE CITY

Different observors interpret urban problems and urban policy from the standpoint of different paradigms. One common urban paradigm has been the utopian perspective of the urban designers who come up with multi million proposals to rebuild or build anew the perfect central city.[1] Another paradigm has been a technocratic paradigm which has stressed the need to infuse the different urban systems, both public and private, with new standards of performance and efficiency. The need to eliminate waste and to reduce the "patronage hustle" are typical concerns of this paradigm. This perspective rightly emphasizes the need to introduce new management systems and skills into the complex realitites of the many American cities which are the fiscal wards of the public purse. What often is not emphasized by this perspective is that the political realities and rivalries have guaranteed inefficiency by the inability to stabilize the revenues of American cities. Stop-and-go federal programs, an eroding tax base, and hostile or indifferent state legislature have all contributed to a lopsided management concern with mobilizing alternative sources of revenue as opposed to a concern with monitoring programs from the standpoint of the effectiveness of the outputs and outcomes.[2] This technocratic perspective has a lot to contribute to the redevelopment of urban public administration in the years ahead.

---

[1] For a full discussion of urban policy paradigms, see "Alernative Agendas for Urban Policy" in The Social Economy of Cities, ed. G. Gappert, H. M. Rose, Sage, 1975.

[2] See the discussion in Urban Outcomes, Levy, Meltsner, and Wildavsky, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1974.

In this paper however we want to suggest that a paradigm of social reconstruction is necessary to address the overriding concerns of human resources development in American cities. We suggest that the urban schools must be a major part of this reconstruction. Up until the urban schools have been treated primarily from a "redemptionist" perspective concerned with desegregation, racial conflicts and the differences in the learning styles of urban youngsters and the teaching styles of a different generation of urban teachers. These human relations concerns have, in many American urban schools, sorted themselves out. A new generation of urban school leadership is emerging which is providing forceful redirection and program improvement in urban classrooms. Therefore, we seem to introduce the perspective of the social reconstruction of American cities by an emphasis on the development of urban neighborhoods as good places to live and raise a family. This by itself is not a radical departure. But in our perspective there are two underlying conditions.

First, both the federal and state governments must guarantee efficient and effective access to racially balanced jobs throughout the metropolitan areas to the residents of any neighborhoos or community. This guarantee will require a radical redirection of housing and transportation policies and will require much more extensive and intensive employment development by the joint efforts of the private and public sectors.

Second, the urban school must be seen as the source of the "bottom line" of urban development. It is in the product of the urban school--the skills and attitudes of the urban student--that we must look for the fundamental achievements of urban revitalization. The community and its neighborhood school must be part of the same fabric.

Redlining will not end and property values will not rise if the achievement levels of the school are not improving. Furthermore, the career preparation and job readiness of the urban high school student must be directly tied to the projected employment patterns of the metropolitan labor market. Central city and suburban employment levels may sharply increase but the new jobs may be distributed to new immigrants and leave the existing population with fewer benefits and increased competition. (See Part IV--"Perspective on Urban Stress and Population Changes" in The Social Economy of Cities, ed. Gappert and Rose, Sage). It must be clear that we have a different view of the future of the city and the prospects for urban redevelopment. The traditional appraoch to urban renewal emphasized the CBD (Central Business District) and increased in downtown property values and the fiscal "yield" from the property tax. Urban policy generally has meant housing policy. The increase in the number of "units" has been a primary objective. Many older central cities, especially in the northeast and midwest, are now recognized as just "another place to live" in a complex regional or metropolitan economic system. It is now timely if not overdue for a shift in our urban policy objectives. These should include:

- -increases in employment opportunities and mobility throughout the regional economic sphere for inner city residents;
- -emphasis on the city as a place to live with the development of new policy indicators, social and economic, to guide new forms of revitalization;
- -deliberate conversion of urban facilities, land and institutions to new uses appropriate to new client needs.

Traditionally the delivery of human services in cities--health, education and social, have been fragmented, isolated, highly professional, and not too flexible about adjusting to new demands and populations. These services have often been "treatment oriented," using an urban deficit model rather than a human development model. The energy crisis and other resource scarcities imply that we should not throw our cities away. Cities, with appropriate higher densities, can be energy and resource efficient. Furthermore, it is also clear that any new preference for urban living requires a better quality of community life. It may also be that people's perception of the quality of that community is higher when they feel that they have some command of the services which they receive and that tangible increments of progress can stem from their efforts.

From this analysis we have three conclusions:

- The social reconstruction of cities must be emphasized as well as longing for their economic revitalization and a return to industrial glory.

- There is a need to redefine productivity, performance and efficiencies in the provision of all urban human services. That redefinition must include community preferences and a redefinition of urban development.

- Given the deficits between urban needs and the fiscal support for the desired and required services, more attention must be given to combining services through better planning, coordination of delivery and sensitive cost-effective evaluations. The provision of these services must draw upon local human resources as well. Furthermore, federal programs should not be used to further segment delivery of services through the development of categorical mini-empires.

III. General Assumptions for a New Urban Policy

It is possible to state several assumptions which must be reviewed as the possible basis for thinking about new urban policy at both the federal and state level.

First, although we can expect additional federal funding for urban programs, it is unlikely that there will be any clear national urban strategy. More funds are needed to deal with the complex set of economic and social needs in our cities. But the goal structure of most federal legislation having to do with urban issues tends to be poorly expressed or watered down with respect to any urban commitment. Efforts to enact a national growth policy came to nothing in the early 1970's. A new social vision is needed to guide a new economic and growth policy which adequately incorporates a strategy for urban redevelopment. It is unclear what political forces are strong enough to address this problem. The competition between the "distressed cities" and the younger growth cities is another barrier to uniform policy.

Second, it is appropriate that each state should establish its own unique urban policy. There are several reasons for this. For one thing it is the state that ultimately is responsible for defining what constitutes a city. In New Jersey, for instance, five criteria are used to define 28 urban aid cities.[3] These range in size from Newark with a population of 378,000 to Asbury Park with a population of 17,000.

Furthermore, the nature of the urbanized condition varies widely from state to state. This is shown in Table 1. Depending upon what definition is used, various sets of states represent the twenty most urban states.

TABLE 1

THE TWENTY "MOST URBAN" STATES: 3 INDICATORS

Density Per Square Mile		Percent Urban By Census Definitions*		Percent Population (Cities over 25,000)	
New Jersey	953	California	90.9	California	63
Rhode Island	905	New Jersey	88.9	Arizona	60
Massachusetts	727	Rhode Island	87.0	New York	57
Connecticut	624	New York	85.6	Rhode Island	57
Maryland	397	Massachusetts	84.6	Texas	55
New York	381	Illinois	83.0	Colorado	55
Delaware	277	Hawaii	83.0	Illinois	54
Pennsylvania	262	Nevada	80.9	Hawaii	53
Ohio	260	Utah	80.9	Massachusetts	50
Illinois	199	Florida	80.5	Michigan	49
Michigan	156	Texas	79.8	Nevada	46
Indiana	144	Arizona	79.5	Ohio	42
California	128	Colorado	78.7	Oklahoma	42
Florida	126	Connecticut	77.3	Wisconsin	42
Hawaii	120	Maryland	76.6	Connecticut	41
Virginia	117	Ohio	75.3	Minnesota	40
North Carolina	104	Michigan	73.9	Indiana	40
Tennessee	95	Washington	72.6	New Mexico	40
South Carolina	86	Delaware	72.1	Florida	39
New Hampshire	82	Pennsylvania	71.5	Missouri	39

*Places over 2,500 population

The anomalies are interesting. Of the top 20 states in density, the range is from almost 1000 people per square mile in New Jersey (with a density of 44,081 per square mile in Union City) to less than 82 per square mile in New Hampshire (with a density of 2,734 in Manchester). Using percentage urban (population living in places of over 2,500) 6 other states join the list including Texas and Nevada. Using the third criterion, the percentage living in cities over 25,000 population, 5 other states including Wisconsin and Oklahoma appear and 7 of the original list drop out.

The problem of trying to establish a rather homogeneous approach to the urban problem syndrome consisting of at least 20 states is related to the second problem which is that the 20 "least urban" states control 40% of the votes in the U. S. Senate. This problem can be exaggerated, but the realities of the federalized distribution of power within the U. S. Senate mean that 20 states acting in unison can essentially block any policy of resource allocation which does not consider their interests. In 1970, for instance, out of $24 billion in federal aid to state and local governments, about $5.8 billion (26%) went to the 20 states with the least amount of population in cities over 25,000, while the 20 states with the most population in cities over 25,000 (from California to Missouri) received $13.4 billion or not quite 60% of total federal aids. These 20 states contain about 60% of the population in the country. The 20 least urban (with only about 20% of the national population) received about a five percent federal aid premium for being underpopulated.

With data such as this, it should be clear that it is the state government which must be involved in making sense of how federal programs and funds can affect its population centers of the highest socio-economic

needs. Already, in some states federal aid makes up over 20 percent of the total state budget. Increasingly, both the state executive and state legislature will be seeking to establish controls over the disposition of these funds. This brings us to our third assumption.

Our third assumption is that the federal government should seek a new role whereby it sets both broad policy priorities and performance criteria for funds and programs affecting the areas and the people with the highest socio-economic needs (including rural). The federal government, with the ultimate responsibility for guaranteeing equal opportunity, must provide incentives for other layers of government to address those concerns.

Fourth, inter-agency cooperation and coordination is not only desirable, it is necessary for reasons of fiscal efficiency. It is unlikely that any federal program will be adequately funded to fully meet all the possible needs. The fragmentation of services between agencies and professions is costly from the standpoint of both the delivery system and the client. Combining services at the same site or within a cooperative outreach system can increase program effectiveness, and can be used to increase paraprofessional employment as well. Services to families and to youth are especially in need of collaborative planning.

Fifth, besides developing some kind of inter-agency urban policy, the states must invent new systems of technical assistance to municipal governments. Although our interest is primarily focused on the prospects for inter-agency and inter-urban youth policy, there is a general concern with the provision of technical assistance to urban governments. Municipal management must become much more productive in meeting its diverse and complex needs. New technical assistance centers and a new system of management support services need to be invented. These centers should focus on the adaptation of new technologies and innovative programs for both the private and public sectors.

Our sixth assumption is that the neighborhood should be viewed as the ultimate unit of municipal administration. It is the neighborhood which determines the quality of life of the individual and the family. The role and quality of a community school is the bottom line of neighborhood redevelopment. Each urban public official needs a thread of accountability to what happens in the neighborhoods.

IV. Fiscal Realities

It is difficult but necessary to avoid taking an "urban deficit" attitude to the problems of urban America. Many urban institutions, and this is especially true of many urban schools, are coping extremely well with their day to day crises but with insufficient resources to address broader developmental needs.

Data on New Jersey municipalities and school districts provide a good indicator of the relative fiscal position of urban and non-urban communities.[4] In general, urban communities have much lower capacity to support municipal and educational expenditures. In terms of per capita equalized property value, the urban communities in New Jersey have less than 40 percent the capacity of the non-urban communities. In terms of per capita personal income, cities fare a little better but still have only 70 percent the capacity of non-urban communities. (See lines a. and b. in the accompanying table).

At the same time, urban communities find themselves spending more than their non-urban counterparts to support municipal and educational services. Per capita total local government expenditures in 1974 came to $532 in urban communities and $488 in non-urban communities.

Because of their lower tax bases, and despite state and Federal grants-in-aid to municipal government and to local school districts, urban communities must exert much greater effort (than non-urban communities) to fund their municipal and educational expenditures. In 1974 the total equalized property tax rate in New Jersey's urban communities was 5.18 percent compared to only 2.65 percent in the state's non-urban communities.

In some respects, however, these various comparisons do not provide an adequate measure of the relative fiscal position of urban and non-urban communities in New Jersey, or for that matter, in other states. The above examination of fiscal capacity, expenditures and effort, does not consider two important additional factors. First, different communities face differences

[4] Andrew Reschovsky and James Knickman, "Municipal Overburden in New Jersey: An Assessment" New Jersey Urban Education Research Reports, No. 2, Trenton, New Jersey: Urban Education Observatory, 1976.

TABLE II

Some Indicators of Relative Fiscal Position for New Jersey's Urban Aid and Non Urban Aid Communities

	Urban-Aid Cities	Non-Urban Aid Communities
a. Personal Income, Per Capita, 1972	$ 3,655	$ 5,165
b. Equalized Property Value, Per Capita, 1974	6,309	16,260
c. Municipal Expenditures, Per Capita, 1974	307	215
d. Education Expenditures, Per Capita, 1974	225	273
e. Total Local Government Expenditures, Per Capita, 1974 (c & d)	532	488
f. Total Equalized Property Tax Rate, 1974	5.18%	2,65%
g. Cost of "Minimum Bundles," Per Capita	295	135
h. Equalized Property Tax Rate Needed to Purchase Mimimum Bundles	3.9%	0.8%

in relative needs for municipal and educational services. Second, differences in the cost of providing municipal or educational services across communities influence how much these communities get for the dollar they spend.

In the first area, it is almost self-evident that the need for municipal services may vary across communities. Variations in the demographic or economic composition of the population as well as differences in the community's age, density and physical condition lead to varying needs for specific municipal services. To the extent that needs across communities vary, two communities may have identical expenditures, but one community may find that it is barely supplying required or necessary services while the other community may be able to provide not only the necessary services but also additional or even "luxury" services.

In the second area, costs also may vary substantially across communities. Differences in wages, the costs of borrowing, and in some instances the amount of effort necessary to provide a given level of service (for example more elaborate and expensive equipment is necessary to provide a given level of fire protection in a densely settled, high-rise community compared to a less densely settled one)contribute to overall cost variations.

Thus, an accurate look at the relative fiscal condition of urban and non-urban communities should consider communities' needs for services, and their costs of providing services as well as fiscal capacity, expenditure and effort.

The concept of "municipal overburden" attempts to get at these factors necessary for an accurate assessment of relative fiscal position. Conceptually, "municipal overburden" is a relatively simple idea. It is the extra effort that one community must make to raise revenues sufficiently to pay for necessary services over and above the effort that some other community must exert. The degree of overburden that a community faces is a function of differences in the minimum bundle of necessary services, differences in the cost of services and differences in fiscal capacity.

Although the concept of municipal overburden has great intuitive appeal, unfortunately there are substantial difficulties in measuring the concept empirically. Neither cost data nor data on service needs is widely collected. Moreover, there is a substantial normative component in determining "need." Still, because the concept is such as important one, the New Jersey Urban Education Observatory engaged two consutlants---Dr. Andrew Reschovsky of Rutgers University and Dr. James Knickman of New York University---to make a preliminary estimate of the overburden in New Jersey urban communities. Their results, based on a relatively complex statistical procedure using regression analysis,

point to a high degree of overburden in urban communities. They find that the per capita cost of the "minimum bundle" of necessary services in urban communities is approximately $295 while in non-urban communities it is only $135. The local effort necessary to pay for these minimum bundles also differs significantly. Urban communities would have to have an average equalized property tax rate of 3.9% to purchase their munimum bundles while non-urban communities would only need to tax at a rate of 0.8%*

It is important to note that the extreme burden of overburden costs are in areas such as public safety, sanitation, health and welfare. For instance, the per capita expenditure for police services is $46.00 in our urban communities and only $31.00 in non-urban communities. The difference for urban fire protection is between $35.00 per capita and $14.00. The per capita health expenditures are 400% higher in our urban communities than in our non-urban communities. The educational costs between the two types of communities are almost equal. This probably indicates that we are not compensating our urban schools adequately for the real problems of deliverying services in those areas.

Furthermore, in some cases, the increase in the state share of educational aid has been used not to increase services to meet the educational needs of the high-cost child or student but have been used to reduce the overall property tax burden. In effect, state educational aid helps to offset the costs of other urban services represented by the "overburden" concept. Unless the state governments address all urban costs, urban school aid by itself will be inadequate.

V. A Perspective on National Urban Educational Policy

With this new administration it is both appropriate and timely to assess the educational needs of urban America. The several urban states in the northeast need to articulate a common strategy in order to develop a uniform national policy in support of urban educational development.

Conflict: The Future of City and Suburban Relations

Several issues are easily apparent. The goals of federal legislation related to urban issues tend to be poorly expressed and weak on the question of an urban priority. Too often the content of urban legislation is based on the politics involved in legislative passage. Increasingly, urban legislation may have a windfall dimension for smaller cities and the suburbs. This trend will increase after the 1980 census reallocates congressional representation to the benefit of the suburbs and the western and southern states.

Because of this eventuality, there is considerable evidence of a potential conflict between the legislators of large urban cities and the voting block of suburban legislators. Also, represented in this conflict with the cities are the growth-cities of the West and the South. All will be competing for an ample share of the same federal dollar.

Failure of the Allocation Formulas

Attempts to rewrite allocation formulas to benefit the large cities have some value but may be dysfunctional. But the new formula may benefit some cities at the expense of others. The formula for community development block grants provides for pre-1940 housing. This factor may benefit some northern cities, but under

previous legislation for urban renewal, many of the older tenements of some central cities have been destroyed. This legislation, therefore, may have a much greater impact on the first ring of suburban growth outside center cities which are the older suburbs.

Since there is no good uniform measure of urban needs across different cities in different states, there is a growing feeling that we may need to redesign, or re-establish categorical programs directed to our largest cities. Urban planners are beginning to regard our larger cities as national cities with special national and international significance. One way to bring this about is the development of a national urban leadership program to increase the effectiveness of big city schools. Many educators have felt that the effectiveness with which funds are used is more important than the actual amount of federal dollars going to cities.

Federal legislation could provide for more state participation in the allocation of funds based on performance standards which are planned and managed by statewide planning and evaluation teams. While this move could significantly reduce federal paperwork, the states must develop manageable criteria involving inter-government planning and evaluation. Metro-government is a trend toward larger units of government on a metropolitan - wide basis to broaden the urban tax base and improve delivery of public services.

What we now know as urban inner-city could be subsumed in a metro-government matrix of regional controls. The social, political and economic centrifugal pull away from large urban centers certainly has the political and economic clout to eventually shatter dense concentrations of urban population. Essentially, what cities are experiencing now is closely related to the relentless trend of white and black middle class flight to the suburbs caused by the riots of the late 60's which charred the insides of the key urban centers across the nation. In sum, when whites move out of the central city, they

do not forfeit power to the urban system they leave behind. Therefore, as the power moves from central city out to city parameters, and beyond, the urban centers start to strain at the edges and disintegrate from the geometrical pull of centrifugal forces created by high inflation, prolonged mass unemployment at a time of high production and wide spread prosperity. The result, in the urban centers especially, is a grating contrast between the rich and the poor. Income support becomes a secondary issue to urban inequality.

But, demographically, the new shrunken cities could turn out to be a hollow prize. The options of the urban administrator are likely to be so severely limited that they will have to make a choice between advocating community control from a weak financial base, or accepting programs operated by distant federal control. Urban leadership will also have to decide between encouraging more jobs in the urban community, and dispersal of the urban-black-vote into the expanding suburban employment markets.

Inter-relationship Between Economic, Urban and Human Development

There needs to be a concern that both short-range and long-range plans for urban redevelopment and economic renewal also consider the problems of human resource development within the central cities. Urban redevelopment efforts, regardless of their funding source, should not neglect the important role of community schools and the linking of social service activities with neighborhood schools. Indeed, with the Community Development Act now refunded, it is appropriate to reconsider strategies of the model neighborhood and model schools. It could bring together the appropriate services for different age populations which could reduce the isolation of age segregation. It is timely that the Commerce Department's economic development efforts finally realize that the financial needs of urban cities can best be served by encouraging collaborative planning between institutions of varying social, economic, and

educational development. Far too often the state and local agencies which promote economic development neglect the need to consider educational planning.

Federal Support of Creative Approaches to Racial Integration in Metropolitan Areas

The statement by HEW Secretary Califano that it was his belief that "society places too much of the desegregation burden on local educational systems" is a factor to be considered in metro-government educational planning. More emphasis must be placed on regional and metropolitan racial integration linking programs in fair housing, job training and mobility with urban curriculums. Schools may not be bearing an excessive burden but other institutions seem to carry little or none of their share of the desegregation burden.

Organization and Management R&D for Local Urban School Systems

In the last decade, the large urban school systems have been affected by a shifting demographic profile as well as other apects of social and economic decline. The pupils in city school districts have changed rapidly and continue to do so. At the same time the teachers and administrators in large city school systems have experienced a similar turnover. In most cases, a younger, more dynamic and dedicated group of teachers and principals have emerged. There is a need to develop successful programs of in-service training for urban teachers and administrators so that they may inherit the management of large city school systems and the job of educational renewal. The challenge is how to change inherited structures to make them more responsive to present and future needs. At the same time, data processing systems need to be designed to meet the new demands for accountability and improvement in student achievement. Categorical Federal funds should be made available to state

education agencies for technical assistance to urban districts. Often the technical assistance systems of state government are prevented by Federal and State regulations from intervening with the problems of urban districts. State agencies need to create new ways to study the problem of educational decision making at the local district level. Furthermore, developmental support should be made available to state education agencies to design and develop new ways of providing continuous technical assistance to urban districts which is both relevant and timely.

At the same time it has been easy for state agencies to be distracted from developing or implementing an urban thrust. The routine concerns of the 600 school districts in New Jersey become a "bureaucratic curtain" which limits our ability to address the needs of the 28 urban aid cities of the state. Much of our attention is focused on the management of diverse federal programs.

Curriculum R&D

In general, much of the national R&D effort of the last decade has concentrated on curriculum problems which affect the majority of schools. But few, if any, of these programs have been developed to address problems of urban schools. Moreover, the national R and D community has not considered urban problems as a top priority. Research on different learning styles which emerged out of our experience with multi-culturalism needs to be carefully considered as part of an urban R&D assessment process.

Specific investigation of learning readiness in the urban setting tends to be based on the notion that urban schools should include the following characteristics: (1) a non-punitive atmosphere, (2) pupil-to-pupil tutoring, (3) pupil self-evaluation, (4) a range of curriculum choices, (5) a relevant-to-life curriculum, (6) criterion-referenced testing, and (7) an emphasis on creativity. There is a general need for more research in this area. Many urban educators have said that younger white teachers tend to support a more open instructional approach, while black teachers and older white teachers are more likely to stress the need for structure.

Urban education structures should permit pupils more self-determination, enabling them to start at the level of the curriculum which is appropriate for them. In short, urban pupils must have more options and alternatives. Parkway (in Philadelphia), Metro (in Chicago and Saint Louis) and City-as-School (in New York) are examples of the move toward non-traditional approaches.

Urban School Utilization of R&D Products

The new dissemination thrust of the Office of Education and the NIE Dissemination Resource Group have learned from their consultation with local school administrators. It is time USOE and other Federal agencies such as NIE regional labs work more closely with urban administrators to identify specific

urban concerns. Furthermore, the legislative mandate which requires NIE to set aside 25% of its budget for regional labs and centers should also require the NIE network of regional labs to demonstrate adequate concern for urban education.

Formal and Informal Networks in Support of Urban Innovation

There is a need for all the institutions related to the development of urban areas to find new ways to communicate in formal and informal settings. Innovative urban administrators and advocates of urban improvement need to be involved in the development of action agendas for supportive programs from both the private and public sectors. The key elements in the emerging network should represent local, State and Federal governments, as well as private and public agencies such as foundations, churches and economic interest groups who advocate national urban revitalization. All the groups need to focus on the improvement of educational quality in city schools.

The effective urban school is a reality in most cities. On a building by building basis, individual principals and curriculum leaders have developed high achievement programs. In New Jersey urban schools have produced two of our nationally validated educational programs. Effective urban practices by effective urban practitioners need to share much more extensively. In some cases these practices are low cost options. Urban school mini-grants for the innovative teacher might be an effective approach for both federal and state programs.

VI. Changing Policy

There are at least six approaches to changing policies affecting urban education:

1. Dramatic increases in funding for community schools and community education including funding of parent centers.
2. Substantial funding for in-service needs of the urban education through urban leadership grants.
3. Changes in federal legislation and program to require inter-agency cooperation with regard to urban youth.
4. Increased funding and administrative changes in Title I.
5. Administrative reallocations of federal funds and efforts to support urban education.
6. Radical solutions to radical needs through state interventions.

1. Dramatic Increases in Community Education Funding

The concept of community education is not new, but the philosophical bases of community education are assuming special significance for changing urban communities, and a redefined approach needs to be regenerated as a possible strategy for addressing urban educational and social problems.

The basic philosophy behind community education is the premise that education is a lifelong process and that learning takes place not only in the classroom but in all life experience, including work, social activities, recreation and in individual family and civic settings. The concept revolves around five beliefs:

A. That school facilities should be used as a center for the delivery of not only educational but also recreational, health, social and cultural programs and services;

B. That services provided by a school district should be based on needs identified in close cooperation with the entire community it serves;

C. That services should be provided in school facilities during all hours of the day and evening, year around and for all ages.

D. That the school should maximize utilization of community resources, human, physical and financial;

E. That educators should consider the entire environment of a child if he/she is to become a fully functioning member of society.

In order to address the complexity of contemporary urban problems, however, the concept of community education must be expanded, recognizing the interrelationships among economic, social and educational factors, to address the fundamental problems of declining educational achievement and employment opportunity, and to confront the range of factors which determine the quality of life in urban areas. The community education approach should not only provide for involvement of community residents in the planning, development and programming of educational services, but should also provide a vehicle for optimizing social and economic resources present in a community through integrated delivery of social services, cooperative relationships among political, business and service segments, and continuity among programs which serve people at various points in their development from childhood to functioning, productive adults.

There is no one model of community education which fits all communities, not even all urban communities. A number of programs have been developed throughout the country, and the evaluation of many of them indicates that community education has had positive effects on student attitudes, violence and vandalism. (See Appendix I)

New Jersey has implemented several community education programs. Two school districts, Atlantic City and Elizabeth, have community education centers providing a range of educational, health, recreational, social and community services. A number of others have programs which expand the use of educational facilities to all ages at all times. Some of these have been in existence for as long as ten years. Several districts have cooperatively planned and funded programs with municipal government and social service agencies.

The state's experience with community education has been positive, but a number of new initiatives will potentially expand the concept to dimensions heretofore not considered.

The Governor has asked that a Task Force be established to explore community education as a means of improving fundamental educational services to urban children. The major focus of the Task Force will be a cooperative interagency approach to urban education, social services and community revitalization. Legislation currently pending will provide a $100 million bond issue for school building aid with special consideration to be given for facilities providing social and community services.

Community Schools Act

The Community Schools Act was incorporated as Section 405 in 1974 amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and provides federal financial assistance to state and local educational agencies to develop programs that extend the use of public facilities, especially schools, for community services. Fifty percent of the funds have been earmarked for allocation to SEAs; Fifty percent to LEAs. Although funds under this act do not provide assistance in the construction of facilities, they have provided means for the development, implementation and maintenance of a number of efforts, including several in New Jersey.

Although $17 million has been authorized for FY 77 and $17 million for FY 78, only $3.5 million has been appropriated each year.

Full funding of ESEA section is needed if programs are to be developed to address fundamental urban educational needs. In addition, the following revisions of the act are recommended to maximize flexibility and impact:

1. The definition of community be broadened and focused on a comprehensive approach to all social and community services and facilities;

2. The total appropriation be allocated to state educational agencies, with the requirement that a percentage, perhaps as much as 75 or 80%, be used for the implementation of community education programs in local districts (this provision is supported by the Advisory Council on Adult, Continuing and Community Education);

3. The restriction on use of these funds for facility construction be maintained, but requirements for matching funds be eliminated;

4. Grants be awarded annually but with built-in provisions for continued support up to a total of three to five years.

5. Title I of ESEA provide for a discretionary portion which could be allocated to LEAs by the state as incentive funding to maintain community education services beyond the development period funded under the Community Schools Act. Parent Centers could be funded under this provision.

The concept of parent centers is a new one and has yet to be worked out. But essentially there is a growing awareness that the parent and community must take responsibility for a share of the educational achievement of the urban youngster[5]. In order to do this, technical assistance to parents or other community sources of student assistance must be provided. At least a modest demonstration program could be tried by both federal and state governments.

3. Urban Leadership Grants and other Categorical Approaches.

Given the experience of the 60s with categorical programs and the experience of the 70s with revenue sharing and block grants, it is clear that the complexity of urban problems cannot be addressed through simple approaches to the development of solutions. A balance needs to be struck between centralized programs with a national focus and local capacity for dealing with urban problems.

It can be assumed that local capacity for resolving problems is inadequate in most cities, by sheer virtue of the fact that they are not being resolved. Revenue sharing/block grant funding to local communities does not address that inadequacy except, perhaps, as it related to financial resources. Governance and Management structures are not being modernized.

---

[5]See Home Environment Self-Concept and Urban Student Achievement: A Bibliography and Review of Research, Research Report No. 5, Urban Education Observatory, New Jersey State Department of Education, Trenton, Feb. 1977.

On the other hand, the development of so-called national models leads to over generalization of urban needs and lacks a necessary sensitivity to the diversity among urban communities according to geographic location, size, age, population and other factors.

One possible alternative is to combine aspects of the two approaches to provide targeted funding on a state basis. Federal grants would be allocated according to categorical program criteria, but allocated by states which have discretion over distribution criteria.

The regional approach provides an added benefit heretofore missing in federal funding strategies: continuity in educational planning and needs assessment. State agencies are able to define more exactly what the special needs of their urban communities are than any federal agency can hope to. On the other end of the scale, local communities must juggle a multiplicity of federal funding sources with separate criteria and may never be able to exact a match between their needs and the resources available to them.

A funding strategy which revolves around the state as grantee for its municipalities but still specifies criteria for distribution and use of funds like categorical grants, can provide the needed continuity and, at the same time, insure that communities with the greatest need are served.

Planning Support

The ineffectiveness of educational and social service delivery in urban communities is not just a function of inadequate resources. Urban governments and public institutions are also faced with complex management problems with which they are ill equipped to deal.

What is needed to, in effect, protect programmatic investments in urban areas is advance support for inter-agency planning and organization development. Planning grants are needed to stimulate the development of new alternatives

with a view toward management and implementation strategies, rather than program design. These should be followed by funds for evaluation, research and management assistance.

Old Title V of ESEA provided for grants to states to strengthen leadership resources. A form of that section needs to be substantially revived and given a focus on urban school leadership needs.

It is suggested that funds similar to Title V "strengthening" be awarded to state educational agencies to provide technical assistance and pass-through to urban school districts. It is important that maximum flexibility be provided for the distribution of those funds by the state so that assistance can be targeted to communities with the greatest need, as determined by socio-economic criteria and/or assessment measures. The focus of the program would be the urban educational agency, not state educational agencies, although through state administration. Funds would be made available to urban LEAs for the following purposes:

1. Planning grants to promote better needs assessment and program design.
2. In-service training and staff development by SEA and within LEAs, especially of principals and administrative staff, to allow urban schools to update administrative procedures and adopt more effective management practices among the new urban leaders of education.
3. Organization of community residents, especially parents, to take on the role of planning educational programs in their schools, especially to increase parent roles in Title I programs.
4. Planning and implementing demonstration projects in two areas:
   a. Improved management and delivery of educational services, especially those integrated with other social services.
   b. Establishment of parent centers which would provide technical assistance to urban parents for various purposes.

3. Requirements for Inter-agency Cooperation

The youth employment amendments to CETA require in-school programs but omits any role for the state education agency. It is that kind of flagrant disregard of the state role which needs to be changed. All federal legislation affecting the social and economic development of cities should be linked to a mandated inter-agency urban youth plan at the state level. Such a plan should address performance criteria and provide for uniform evaluation standards.

, at the level of the municipality or county inter-agency planning provisions should be required. For instance, the CETA requirement for a Youth Council should be linked to the Title I Parents Advisory Council and to community school efforts.

4. Title I Changes

The issues surrounding Title I are various and complex. One approach is to organize proposed changes into 4 areas. These include:

- Funding levels and cost issues
- State administration and planning flexibility
- "Unfreezing" the regulations
- Associated changes in other federal programs

Specific proposals might include -

- Full funding and State Matching Funds for Title I

  ESEA Title I is currently funded at a level that serves only 50% of the children's need nationally. Some states have funded programs to make up this difference; others have not. It is proposed that funding be increased to 75% of need for those states able to provide for the additional 25% of children needing compensatory services.

- District responsibility for general needs assessment

Presently school districts are responsible for conducting the general needs assessment of all eligible resident students. In some instances this constitutes an unusual financial and manpower burden since many resident students attend non-public facilities both in and outside of the district. Generally districts do not object to assuming reasonable costs for retrieval of needs assessment data.

The concern is that reasonable provisions be made to allow districts to defray extraordinary expenses associated with obtaining sufficient needs assessment information from non-public facilities in cases where significant numbers of students are attending such facilities.

- Costs related to implementation of the ESEA Title I Evaluation and Reporting System

The implementation of this system will create additional manpower training and expenditure needs, both for the state and local districts, which cannot be adequately addressed within current budget parameter without reducing services to students. If additional costs are to be absorbed by existing funds the amount of direct instructional services to children will be reduced in many cases.

The proposed evaluation system holds the promise of a number of benefits which should prompt the allocation of funds to insure its proper implementation. O.E. should estimate the costs of implementation over a two year period and provide those additional funds.

- Accountability for Results

The data requirements for application, reporting, and auditing for ESEA Title I are an enormous paperwork burden. It is proposed that the implementation of the IRS-type system be continued and that data demands on districts showing verified gains be reduced. Demands for plans from those with poor results would be increased This would follow the T and E process in New Jersey.

- Restrictions regarding use of Title I funded staff for general teacher duties

Restricting school districts from using Title I teachers for general teacher duties required of all other teaching staff creates ill-will among teachers and poses significant administrative problems. If Title I teaching staff are hired under full contract then some provision should be made to allow school districts to assign these staff members to general duties such as playground supervision and lunchroom supervision. Such a provision could place limits of these uses but should reflect the "reasonable" use of Title I staff.

- Allocation notification at time of application development

School districts are expected to prepare the Title I application during the spring preceding the program year. Some districts do not know the amount of the allocation they will receive. They are forced to plan a program on a minimum estimate which, historically, has been calculated at 85% of the current allocation. To insure the level and amount of services rendered in one year can be provided in the subsequent year districts have found it necessary to create carry-over balances to ensure that the 85% can be funded at or near 100% of the previous year. This leads to large statewide carry-over balances which, on the surface, makes it appear that the state is not using its Title I monies.

Provision should be made to expedite the notification of allocations to permit districts to plan programs on actual dollars rather than estimated dollars.

- The integration of community education programs with Title I/CETA

Community education is a concept receiving wide attention. The articulation of community education with Title I and CETA is a necessary and somewhat natural marriage of concepts. If the schools are designed to train in skill areas, and there are community members in need of such training, then the extension of the services and programs to the community is a desirable result. In addition, a program designed to train individuals in various life skill areas needs the support and cooperation of the community at large.

- The articulation of Title I funds with CETA/YEDPA funds

The current emphasis on programs that provide remedial services to students with demonstrated academic skill deficiencies should be extended. The emphasis should be expanded to include those remedial programs that stress basic life skills and are integrated with job-specific training. The increasing emphasis on youth employment implies a need for programs which ensure that students possess sufficient basic communication and numeric skills in order to obtain and sustain their own employment. In addition youth need preparation in job seeking and job performance skills. The integration of Title I funds for educational preparation and CETA funds for job-related preparation seems not only worthwhile but necessary.

- A Special Note on Bilingual Education

The present legislative provision for bilingual education as part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act tends to narrow the perspective of bilingual education as a remedial program. Since bilingual education can, and most certainly has become, an important facet of general education programs, it would seem most desirable to enact a separate section of ESEA which focuses on bilingual education as a general education program which has a remedial component. Such legislation would provide recognition of the needs of bilingual students and should provide for sufficient funding and programming, both general and remedial.

This federal demonstration project should be reauthorized as a state administered program based on the school aged, limited English proficient population in each state. Funds for language assessment programs might have to be provided. State would develop a State Plan for bilingual education which would set out the criteria for intrastate allocations.

- A Special Note on Emergency School Assistance Provisions

Most of these funds for desegragation are being used for compensatory education for various reasons including the under-funding of Title I eligibles. If Title I is funded at a higher level, ESEA funds could be directed more to intergroup relations programs and to the development of curriculum changes and teacher instate. Furthermore, this program should also be administered within a state by the SEA which would then suballocate the funds following an appropriate State Plan.

5. Federal Program Administration

In some areas the existing regulations of federal programs provide substantial leeway to emphasize an urban priority. This is especially true for NIE. A number of new directions could be set through new program policies. For instance, in the area of R and D dissemination and utilization, the following could be proposed:

First, a separate funding category be designated for large city dissemination efforts (intercity and intracity) to constitute a targeted dollar commitment across all NIE divisions.

Such funding would be for:

1. Greatly improved R&D dissemination knowledge concerning large cities.
2. Development of improved (through dollar incentives) SEA/large city dissemination relationships.
3. Improved knowledge base as specifically pertains to large city school improvement products, development and problems.
4. Concern for greater R&D utilization within all segments of the complex large city educational structure.
5. Initiate a large city dissemination capacity building program (to work in conjunction with on-going SEA dissemination planning and development).

Second, support for a task force to examine the problems of large city dissemination. Such a task force would be broadly professional based (school, economics, educational organizational structure, disseminators) and have sufficient funding to call in consultants as viewed necessary. (Note: We know far more about good dissemination within rural and suburban areas than within complex large city school systems).

Third, the development of an urban focused regional education laboratory to serve the cities in the northeast corridor. Such a laboratory would have an explicit urban mission in the areas of management, learning styles, social and health needs, etc.

Besides developing inter-state support for relevant "urban" changes in ESEA specifically and in federal policy generally, we need to consider the value and purpose of developing inter-state, and inter-urban, relations and programs. There are at least four areas of particular interest. These are:

a) Program Development

supporting the exchange and diffusion of successful practices and programs in urban education among urban practitioners.

b) Personnel Development

facilitating exchanges between urban practitioners and developing specialized training and new in-service models for urban teachers and principals with special attention to new management and inter-agency roles.

c) Organization Development

Given the changes in the State/city partnership, there is a need to share and evaluate our intervention experiences, successes and failures.

d) Specialized Development

with the dynamic nature of change in our cities, the administrative and curriculum leadership has learned to cope with crisis management and political manipulation, but in most cases this has left little energy in resources for taking advantage of the opportunities offered by the diversity of the urban population. Specialized development in the areas of bilingual and bicultural, foreign languages, experiential learning, etc. has been neglected.

6. Radical Solutions to Radical Problems Through State Intervention

Like it or not, each state education agency which has had to come to grips with the realities of some large city school system has to develop the capability for intensive interventions. In New Jersey the state at one point had to take over the fiscal system of the Newark school system. We now maintain an auditor-general in Newark. We have intervened less dramatically with respect to the educational program but plans have been proposed for a "Big Mac" type of takeover. The Municipal Assistance Corporation in New York City could be reinvented as a Quality Control System for urban schools. Such efforts may be needed.

However, such dramatic interventions are only a temporary crisis intervention. Other efforts such as an Urban Youth Development Corporation may be needed for the long-term restructuring of the social, economic, and educational needs of urban youth.

Other radical interventions may also be required. Dr. Alfred Bloch, a Los Angeles psychiatrist, after researching the existence of "combat neurosis," in violence-laden urban schools, has called for the formation of crisis intervention teams as well as teacher clinics for the "battered" teacher who faces both psychological stress as well as physical assaults. Although these conditions may be viewed as an extreme, they do occur in our city schools. The state agency must address the tendency of these conditions to reappear.

APPENDIX I

FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Community Education

It's Effects on Various Problems

A Summary

1. Violence/Vandalism/Attendance Levels

Philip Deaver in "Violence and Vandalism in the School: the problem and how to address it" states. . . Community Education programs and processes have been identified as helpful in the effort to curb school violence and vandalism. He continues by discussing Sunnyvale, California project, and quotes the following findings as direct results of Community Education:

- — 33% reduction in vandalism while it was rising in neighboring schools.
- — 26% reduction in referrals to juvenile probation department compared to 16.3% reduction in the rest of the county.
- — a special program for those averaging less than 50% attendance brought their attendance to an average 83%, and the high school adopted that special program on a permanent basis.
- — prior to the community school program, suspensions were at an annual 112; in the second year of the program, suspensions were under 50.
- — students were involved in initiation, supervision and grievance handling; fights in the school were reduced from 3 per day to 4 per month.
- — cost benefit: cost for a director and support, $24,800; benefit, $68,000.

2. Declining Enrollments

Many districts nationally are pursuing Community Education as a solution to this problem, as C.E. offers a conceptual base for a varity of alternative uses of space, ranging from single classrooms to an entire school. In New Jersey, Bridgeton, Wharton, and Montville are just three specific examples. Alternatives such as the following are being employed:

— pre-school programs in schools;

— senior citizens nutrition projects and related services in schools;

— a variety of health and social services in schools;

— CETA job training programs;

— parks and recreation activities;

— and, adult education courses.

The New Jersey Department of Education presently has a list of over 150 different "non-traditional" uses of school facilities typically found in districts adopting Community Education. (Most of these alternatives also have a funding base which helps pay facility related cost).

3. Duplication of Effort

The Bethlehem Area Community Education program was designed in 1973 on the belief that Community Education offered a solution to this problem. The evaluation of the program conducted in its second year of operation concluded:

— improved coordination between participating agencies;

— a reduction in the overall cost of delivering services;

— improved accessibility to services as a result of decentralization to the neighborhood level.

The West Side Complex in Atlantic City, New Jersey is a second example of how Community Education is bringing about coordination and cooperation between agencies and organization in planning, programming, and budgeting.

4. Schools Responsiveness to Community (Isolation)*

Marian Sherman Sterns' and Susan Peterson's studies between 1968 and 1970 identified a correlation between the level of parent participation and the level of institutional change within the community. The Coleman studies, and studies by such noted researchers as James Vanecko, Marilynn Gittell and T. Edward Hollander each show a relationship between citizen participation and the school "responsiveness" to the community. There are many other studies which have conclusions similar to these regarding citizen participation.

5. Academic Achievement and Community Involvement

James Coleman's studies in the late 1960's concluded that factors strongly associated with student achievement were the individual students' family background and socioeconomic class:

> This is the implication that stems from the following results taken together: (1) the great importance of family background for achievement; (2) the fact that the relation of family background to achievement does not diminish over the years of school; (3) the relatively small amount of school-to-school variation that is not accounted for by differences in family background, indicating the small independent effect of variations in school facilities, curriculum, and staff upon achievement. . . .
>
> Taking all of these results together, one implication stands out above all: That schools bring little influence to bear on a child's achievement that is independent of his background and general social context.
>
> In fact, there is little if any research showing "the answer" to improving academic achievement. There is, however, a great deal of research suggesting an association between student achievement and elements of Community Education (i.e.; parent and citizen participation, considering the childs total environment as having educational impact, and creating positive self-concepts).

*IRCD Bulletin, Volumn X, Number 3, 1975.